DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 732 CS 502 171

AUTHOR Hellweg, Susan A.
TITLE Perception of a Communication Source: An Examination of the Ideal Supervisor and Subordinate within a Military Organization.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Portland, Oregon, April 13-17, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; *Credibility; Group Dynamics; *Group Relations; Measurement Techniques; Military Personnel; *Organizational Communication; Research Needs; *Role Perception; *Semantic Differential; *Speech Communication; Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS Communication Research; *Homophily

ABSTRACT

A study was designed to examine an underlying assumption regarding the use of the semantic differential in measuring the credibility and homophily of a communicator, namely, that responses to an ideal source position themselves at one extreme end of the scale, reflecting the monotonic function of the instrument such that the highest response frequency moves down the scale as the evaluation of the source decreases. Two groups of male regular commissioned officers, one containing 148 respondents, the other containing 187 respondents, completed scales relative to credibility and homophily for one of two sources: the ideal male immediate supervisor and the ideal male immediate subordinate. Analysis of the data revealed that all responses to items were significantly different from the extremity assumption of the instrument, but with various degrees of strength of association. Significantly different responses were found for 16 of 30 credibiltiy items and 8 of 16 homophily items between perceptions of the ideal supervisor and subordinate. (Twelve tables of data are appended.) (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166732

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERCEPTION OF A COMMUNICATION SOURCE: AN EXAMINATION OF THE IDEAL SUPERVISOR AND SUBORDINATE WITHIN A MILITARY ORGANIZATION

Susan A. Hellweg
Communication Research and Service
University of Southern California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan A. Hellweg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention
Organizational Communication Division

April 1976
Portland, Oregon

The author is currently a doctoral student in Speech Communication at the University of Southern California and is the Administrative Assistant to the Dean of Academic Planning at California State College, Dominguez Hills.

CS502171

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine an underlying assumption regarding the use of the semantic differential in measuring the credibility and homophily of a communicator, namely, that responses to an ideal source position themselves at one extreme end of the scale, reflecting the monotonic function of the instrument, such that the highest response frequency moves down the scale as the evaluation of the source decreases. Two groups of male regular commissioned officers, one containing one hundred and forty-eight respondents, the other containing one hundred and eighty-seven respondents, completed scales relative to credibility and homophily for one of two sources: (1) the ideal male immediate supervisor; and (2) the ideal male immediate subordinate. Data derived from the study was statistically treated by a single sample t test, a strength of association test (omega squared), and an analysis of variance. In addition, a frequency distribution, as well as a factor analysis, was performed. All responses to items were found to be significantly different from the extremity assumption of the instrument, but with various degrees of strength of association. Significantly different responses were found for sixteen of thirty credibility items and eight of sixteen homophily items between perceptions of the ideal supervisor and subordinate. Implications of the findings and suggestions for future research were advanced.

PERCEPTION OF A COMMUNICATION SOURCE: AN EXAMINATION
OF THE IDEAL IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR AND
SUBORDINATE WITHIN A MILITARY ORGANIZATION

Inherent within almost any definition of an organization is a reference to the existence of interdependent relationships as one of the primary features. One of these relationships is illustrated by the supervisor-subordinate unit which is a necessary predecessor to any organization seeking to achieve goals through a division of labor and hierarchy of authority. If the supervisor-subordinate relationship is healthy, the maximization of its potential in the form of productivity, efficiency, and positive attitudes toward the organization seems possible. Part of the evaluation of such a relationship would seem to be in the perception the participants have of one another.

Research has shown that communicative effectiveness is mediated by the attitude that a receiver has toward a communication source.[1] This attitude is based upon the way in which a receiver perceives a communicator; a multitude of stimulus factors are involved in the evaluation of a communication source. Empirical evidence[2] suggests that perceptions of source credibility and homophily are related to the assessment of a communicator.[3] Receivers are more persuaded by communication sources perceived as credible than by those perceived less favorably. In addition, it is generally the case that sources homophilous in all respects with their receivers are more persuasive than those who are not, with the one exception that their competence relevant to the topic in question appears to rank above that of their receivers.

Several research studies have been reported which focus upon the perception of supervisor credibility by subordinates.[4] Falcione (1974)

demonstrated that subordinate satisfaction is directly related to perceived supervisor credibility. No research is available in the literature which deals with the homophily construct in conjunction with the perception of supervisors by subordinates.

Assuming that the semantic differential is the appropriate instrument to measure both source credibility and homophily, one might suspect that the ideal communication source in view of each of these constructs would be located at the extreme positive end of the scale. This would appear to be an underlying assumption of the semantic differential, with the rating of such a source decreasing as the peak response frequency moves down the scale toward the opposite extreme end of the scale. Such an interpretation would reflect the monotonic function of the scale. Since both constructs have been shown empirically to be multidimensional in nature, one would then expect the ideal source to be described in extreme positive terms on each of the dimensions. Assuming, for example, that the dimensions of credibility identified by Falcione (1974) for organizational sources are viable, then the ideal source, under these terms, would be considered: (1) extremely safe; (2) extremely competent; (3) extremely extroverted; and (4) extremely emotionally stable. While it may be intuitively reasonable to accept this assumption, it requires empirical examination for a number of reasons.

The assumption that one extreme of the semantic differential represents the ideal source in terms of the two constructs refutes hetereogeneous perception of high and low credibility and homophily by an audience. Individuals do, in fact, perceive other individuals differently in reference to the two constructs, since their values, attitudes, and referents differ.

In addition, it seems reasonable to assume that individuals do not

interpret scale items provided within such instruments in the same manner. Such instruments do not offer operational definitions relative to item content to respondents. Therefore, what one specific item means to one individual, regardless of any personal difference in attitudes, values, or referents, may not be what it means to another individual.

Research[5] relevant to the homophily construct suggests that individuals prefer to communicate with those very similar to themselves and that under such conditions communication is highly effective. The inference to be drawn from such research is that people tend to be attracted to those similar to themselves. If, indeed, this is the case, then one might expect a person to rate the ideal source as someone similar to himself. The homophily principle would suggest that the ideal source would be away from the extreme ends of the scales relevant to measuring the two constructs and that there would be a high degree of difference among receivers as to what point on the scale was representative of the ideal source.

A number of researchers have empirically demonstrated that credibility dimensions and their respective factor structures vary across sources;[6] more recently, this has been shown also to be the case for homophily dimensions and their respective factor structures.[7] It seems conceivable that this be true for the ideal source, in terms of both constructs.

Additional evidence for questioning the underlying assumption of the semantic differential utilized to measure the two constructs is provided by research conducted by Clark, Stewart, and Marston (1972) and Heston (1973). In requesting respondents to indicate their conceptualization of the highest credible source, Clark, Stewart, and Marston found the mean for all dimensions on a seven-point semantic differential to be at least

.786 away from the extreme positive end; for three of the five dimensions involved in their analysis, the researchers found the highest credible source to be more than one full scale unit away from the extreme positive end. Using deviation scores[8] as a primary basis for analysis, Heston (1973) found the ideal credible on a seven-point semantic differential to be moderately competent, highly sociable, of good character, moderately composed, and neutral in terms of extroversion; the researcher also found that such a conceptualization varies over source types. Neither study, however, took into consideration the sex of the target source nor the sex of the respondent. In neither study was there an attempt made to establish whether or not there was statistical significance in the data.

While the supervisor-subordinate relationship offers some variation from the broad range of interpersonal relationships from which these arguments are based, some of the same principles would seem to apply. It is on this basis that this study was proposed.

The present study was designed to examine the conceptualization of the ideal immediate supervisor and subordinate within a military organization, employing source credibility and homophily as a basis for analysis. This study was designed to examine source perception within a bidirectional framework: perception of the ideal immediate supervisor by immediate subordinates and perception of the ideal immediate subordinate by immediate supervisors. The dependent variables were the responses to the source credibility and homophily instruments; the independent variable was the target source, the alternatives being the ideal immediate supervisor or the ideal immediate subordinate. The research questions for this study were:

1. Does ideal (credibility) vary from the assumption of the semantic (homophily)

   differential as an instrument to measure (immediate supervisor) (immediate subordinate)

   (credibility), in terms of its monotonic function, such that the (homophily)

   positive extreme end of the scale serves as its highest point?;

2. Does variability occur across interpersonal communication sources within the organization as a function of this conceptualization?

SUBJECTS

The subjects employed in this study were derived from a military organization. All subjects were regular male commissioned officers with between two and ten years of active duty experience in the military (the greatest number had between two and six years of experience, with 11.6% at two, 20.6% at three, 16.1% at four, 11.0% at five, and 12.2% at six). The majority of the subjects fell into either the eighteen to twenty-five age category (32.8%) or the twenty-six to thirty-five age category (64.2%). In addition, the majority of respondents had completed college (65.7%) or had at least received some college experience (20.3%). Each subject was to have had a minimum of one immediate subordinate and one immediate supervisor. Only those individuals who had worked in their present supervisor-subordinate unit and who had been located at their present site for one month or more were utilized in this study (the greatest number had done so for either three months, 10.1%, four months, 7.2%, six months, 9.6%, seven months, 6.6%, twelve months, 13.4%, or eighteen months, 8.4%).

Using a simple random technique, subjects were divided equally into two groups. three hundred in one to conceptualize the ideal immediate male supervisor and three hundred in the other to conceptualize the ideal immediate male

subordinate. Of the six hundred subjects contacted, one hundred and forty-eight responded to the ideal immediate male supervisor and one hundred and eighty-seven responded to the ideal immediate male subordinate.

MATERIALS

The instruments employed in this study in measuring source credibility and homophily were the following: (1) for source credibility, the scales (thirty semantic differential items) developed, specifically for assessing immediate superior credibility, by Falcione (1974);[9] and (2) for homophily, the scales (sixteen semantic differential items) developed by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975).[10] The same instruments were used in measuring both the ideal immediate supervisor and subordinate.

PROCEDURE

Through utilization of a simple random technique, six hundred subjects were equally divided into two groups (three hundred in each), one to conceptualize the ideal immediate male supervisor and one to conceptualize the ideal immediate male subordinate. Questionnaires were mailed to the subjects, with a cover letter fully describing the nature of the project. Each subject was to complete the same questionnaires, except that he was requested to use either the ideal immediate male supervisor or the ideal immediate male subordinate as a frame of reference for each. Of the six hundred sent, one hundred and forty-eight supervisor questionnaires were returned and one hundred and eighty-seven subordinate questionnaires were returned.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data derived from this study was submitted to a one-tailed single sample t test, as described by Blalock (1960),[11] using a .05 level as an acceptable criterion for significance, to test the underlying extremity assumption

of the semantic differential against any other positioning of the ideal source on the scale, as reflected in the first research question. This was followed by a strength of association test (omega squared), as described by Hays (1963),[12] to determine the meaningfulness of any deviations from the extremity assumption.

In order to test the second research question, a one-way analysis of variance was performed, so as to examine the data across source types (the ideal immediate male supervisor, the ideal immediate male subordinate).

In addition, a frequency distribution was computed in order to establish means and standard deviations, and a factor analysis was performed to determine the perceptual criteria utilized by the respondents in completing the questionnaires. In interpreting the results of the factor analytic procedures, the following criteria were employed: (1) for termination of factor extraction, an eigenvalue of 1.0 was established; (2) for an item to be considered as being loaded on a factor, a primary loading of .60 or higher was required, with no secondary loading higher than .40; and (3) for a factor to be considered meaningful, it was to consist of at least two items with satisfactory loadings.

Data for each construct was handled separately in each analysis. The above statistical procedures were intended to be sufficient to answer both research questions, in addition to yielding information pertinent to, but not explicitly demanded by, the research questions as stated.

RESULTS

Table 1 and Table 2 list the means and standard deviations for all of the credibility and homophily scale items provided on the questionnaires.[13] This delineation provides examination of such data for the target sources as a whole, as well as for the ideal supervisor and ideal subordinate separately.

Means on the credibility scale items as a whole fell between 1.349 ("fair-unfair") and 4.724 ("mild-headstrong"), with sixteen of the items below 2.000, twelve of the items between 2.000 and 3.000, one of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and one of the items over 4.000. Ten of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1.000, with eighteen of these items between 1.000 and 1.500, and two of these items between 1.500 and 2.000. Means on the credibility scale items for the supervisor target source fell between 1.155 ("fair-unfair") and 4.646 ("mild-headstrong"), with sixteen of the items below 2.000, twelve of the items between 2.000 and 3.000, one of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and one of the items over 4.000. Nineteen of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1.000, with nine of these items between 1.000 and 1.500, and two of these items between 1.500 and 2.000. Means on the credibility scale items for the subordinate target source fell between 1.503 ("fair-unfair") and 4.785 ("mild-headstrong"), with fourteen of the items below 2.000, fourteen of the items between 2.000 and 3.000, one of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and one of the items over 4.000. Seven of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1.000, with twenty-one of these items between 1.000 and 1.500, and two of these items between 1.500 and 2.000.

Means on the homophily scale items as a whole fell between 2.922 ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") and 4.052 ("status like mine-status different from mine"), with three of the items below 3.000, eleven of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and two of the items over 4.000. Five of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1,000, with eleven of these items between 1.000 and 1.500. Means on the homophily scale items for the supervisor target source fell between 2.687 ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") and 4.027 ("same size as I am-different size than I am"), with three of the items below 3.000, twelve of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and one of the

items over 4.000. Six of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1.000, with ten of these items between 1.000 and 1.500. Means on the homophily scale items for the subordinate target source fell between 2.962 ("morals like mine-morals unlike mine") and 4.168 ("status like mine-status different from mine"), with one of the items below 3.000, nine of the items between 3.000 and 4.000, and six of the items over 4.000. Five of these items had standard deviations between 0.500 and 1.000, with eleven of these items between 1.000 and 1.500.

Using 1.652 as the critical value of t for the three hundred and thirty-five subjects at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all credibility items for the subjects as a whole, as shown in Table 3. These t values ranged from 7.822 ("just-unjust") to 64.935 ("mild-headstrong"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 15.23% ("just-unjust") to 92.68% ("mild-headstrong") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 11%-20%, three; (2) 21%-30%, three; (3) 31%-40%, six; (4) 41%-50%, four; (5) 51%-60%, eight; (6) 61%-70%, four; (7) 71%-80%, one; (8) 81%-90%, none; and (9) 91%-100%, one.

Using 1.660 as the critical value of t for the one hundred and forty-eight subjects responding to the ideal supervisor at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all credibility items, as shown in Table 3. These t values ranged from 3.721 ("fair-unfair") to 40.865 ("mild-headstrong"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 7.99%

("fair-unfair") to 91.91% ("mild-headstrong") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 1%-10%, two; (2) 11%-20%, two; (3) 21%-30%, two; (4) 31%-40%, three; (5) 41%-50%, nine; (6) 51%-60%, five; (7) 61%-70%, four; (8) 71%-80%, one; (9) 81%-90%, one; and (10) 91%-100%, one.

Using 1.660 as the critical value of t for the one hundred and eighty-seven subjects responding to the ideal subordinate at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all credibility items, as shown in Table 3. These t values ranged from 6.896 ("just-unjust") to 50.622 ("mild-headstrong"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 19.93% ("just-unjust") to 93.23% ("mild-headstrong") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 11%-20%, two; (2) 21%-30%, five; (3) 31%-40%, six; (4) 41%-50%, three; (5) 51%-60%, eight; (6) 61%-70%, four; (7) 71%-80%, one; (8) 81%-90%, none; and (9) 91%-100%, one.

Using 1.652 as the critical value of t for the three hundred and thirty-five subjects at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all homophily items for the subjects as a whole, as shown in Table 4. These t values ranged from 26.795 ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") to 62.260 ("same size as I am-different size than I am"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 68.35% ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") to 92.11% ("same size as I am-different size than I am") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges

for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 61%-70%, three; (2) 71%-80%, one; (3) 81%-90%, eleven; and (4) 91%-100%, one.

Using 1.660 as the critical value of t for the one hundred and forty-eight subjects at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test responding to the ideal supervisor, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all homophily items, as shown in Table 4. These t values ranged from 16.778 ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") to 39.714 ("same size as I am-different size than I am"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 65.61% ("shares my values-doesn't share my values") to 91.47% ("same size as I am-different size than I am") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 61%-70%, three; (2) 71%-80%, one; (3) 81%-90%, eleven; and (4) 91%-100%, one.

Using 1.660 as the critical value of t for the one hundred and eighty-seven subjects responding to the ideal subordinate at the .05 level in a one-tailed t-test, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal source) on all homophily items, as shown in Table 4. These t values ranged from 21.106 ("morals like mine-morals unlike mine") to 47.951 ("same size as I am-different size as I am"). Submitting the t values of these items to omega squared resulted in a range of 70.61% ("morals like mine-morals unlike mine") to 92.55% ("same size as I am-different size than I am") relative to their strength of association. In terms of the specific percentage ranges for the individual items, the following can be reported: (1) 61%-70%, two; (2) 71%-80%, three; (3) 81%-90%, ten; and (4) 91%-100%, one.

Four dimensions emerged as a result of the factor analysis on the source

credibility items, as reported in Table 6. The first dimension, consisting of four items, appeared to be a sociability factor. The second dimension, containing four items, seemed to be a character/competence factor. The third dimension, consisting of three items, appeared to be an extroversion factor. The fourth dimension, containing two items, seemed to be a composure factor.

Four dimensions emerged as a result of the factor analysis on the homophily items, as reported in Table 8. The first dimension, consisting of four items, appeared to be an attitude/behavior factor. The second dimension, containing two items, seemed to be an appearance factor. The third dimension, consisting of two items, appeared to be a background factor. The fourth dimension, containing two items, seemed to be a value/appearance factor.

In performing a one-way analysis of variance, significant differences were revealed for sixteen of the thirty source credibility items at the .05 level between perceptions of the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate (critical value of F = 3.89), as shown in Table 9. The items found to be significant were : (1) "honest-dishonest"; (2) "friendly-unfriendly"; (3)"pleasant-unpleasant"; (4) "cooperative-negativistic"; (5) "just-unjust"; (6) "unselfish-selfish"; (7) "fair-unfair"; (8) "not jealous-jealous"; (9) "trained-untrained"; (10) "informed-uninformed"; (11) "expert-inexpert"; (12) "skilled-unskilled"; (13) "fast-slow"; (14) "bold-timid"; (15) "poised-nervous"; and (16) "poised-tense."

In performing a one-way analysis of variance, significant differences were found for eight of the sixteen homophily items at the .05 level between perceptions of the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate (critical value of F = 3.89), as shown in Table 10. The items established as significant were: (1) "thinks like me-doesn't think like me"; (2) "from social class similar to mine-from social class different from mine"; (3) "economic situation

like mine-economic situation different from mine"; (4) "background similar to mine-background different from mine"; (5) "sexual attitudes like mine-sexual attitudes unlike mine"; (6) "shares my values-doesn't share my values"; (7) "looks similar to me-looks different from me"; and (8) "resembles me-doesn't resemble me."

Through conducting a one-way analysis of variance on the source credibility factors extracted in this research, it was demonstrated that a significant difference existed for Factor 2 between perceptions of the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate (critical value of F = 3.89), as shown in Table 11. This factor, consisting of four items, was identified as a character/competence dimension.

Through conducting a one-way analysis of variance on the homophily factors extracted in this study, it was determined that significant differences existed for Factor 3 and Factor 4 between perceptions of the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate (critical value of F = 3.89), as shown in Table 12. The third factor, consisting of two items, was identified as a background dimension. The fourth factor, consisting of two items, was identified as a value/appearance dimension.

DISCUSSION

The first research question posed in this study challenged the extremity assumption of the semantic differential, predicated upon responses to the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate on source credibility and homophily scale items. Based upon the significance difference demonstrated for each source credibility and homophily item between the actual and expected means at the .05 level, it would seem appropriate to assume that the extremity assumption was disconfirmed in this study. At the same time, however, further examination should be given to the items individually, in terms of their relative

contribution to this disconfirmation.

In terms of overall means, sixteen of the source credibility items fell between the first and second interval of the semantic differential scale, twelve between the second and third, one between the third and fourth, and one between the fourth and fifth. In contrast, three of the homophily items fell between the second and third interval of the semantic differential scale, eleven between the third and fourth, and two between the fourth and fifth, in terms of overall means. This suggests that, relatively speaking, source credibility conforms more to the extreme positioning on the semantic differential scale than does homophily for ideal sources within the organizational context, as defined in this study. This finding would tend to support the general principles of credibility and homophily, in the sense that while individuals probably tend to seek out those high in competence and character (or most other aspects of credibility), they also seek out those most like themselves in attitudes and values (or most other aspects of homophily).

It is interesting to note that the standard deviations for the homophily items in this research did not differ greatly, on an overall basis, from those for source credibility, as indicated by the standard deviations listed in Table 1 and Table 2. For the thirty source credibility items, ten fell between 0.500 and 1.000, eighteen fell between 1.000 and 1.500, and two fell between 1.500 and 2.000. For the sixteen homophily items, five fell between 0.500 and 1.000, and eleven between 1.000 and 1.500. This finding suggests that a similar degree of differential perception exists for items associated with both constructs, on an overall basis, with regard to ideal sources within the organizational context, as defined in this study.

While the t values shown in Table 3 and Table 4 provide evidence of a significance difference for all source credibility and homophily items employed

in this research, it is important to note the strengths of association computed by omega squared. The most obvious fact to note is the substantially higher strength of association percentages for the homophily items than for the source credibility items. While some source credibility items did fall into high percentage categories (six over 61%), all of the homophily items did. This seems reasonable since the means for the homophily items were generally farther from the positive extreme end of the scale than were those for source credibility.

It is conceivable that the high level of responding at or toward the neutral area of the semantic differential (as reflected in the means), accompanied by large variances in response patterns (as reflected in the standard deviations) for particular items, occurred as a result of the absence of true bipolar adjectives for these scales. Cases in point would be: "mild-headstrong" (mean, 4.724; standard deviation, 1.045), "virtuous-sinful" (mean, 2.892; standard deviation, 1.276), and "adventurous-cautious" (mean, 2.850; standard deviation, 1.213). An alternative explanation for such occurrences, as well as for those items with high means but moderate standard deviations, might be that the respondents found certain items to be relatively immaterial criteria in perceiving the ideal supervisor or subordinate, most specifically within the military context. Examples of items, perhaps, fitting within the parameters of this explanation would be: "same size as I am-different size than I am" (mean, 4.042; standard deviation, 0.889), "resembles me-doesn't resemble me" (mean, 3.970; standard deviation, 0.987), and "looks similar to me-looks different from me" (mean, 3.958; standard deviation, 0.976).

The second research question posed in this study was directed at examining the challenge to the extremity assumption of the semantic differential, focused upon in the first research question, across communication sources,

specifically the ideal immediate male supervisor and subordinate within the military. A significant difference was demonstrated in this study between perceptions of the ideal supervisor and subordinate for sixteen of the thirty source credibility items and for eight of the sixteen homophily items.

For twenty-five of the thirty source credibility items, responses to the ideal supervisor conformed more to the extremity assumption of the semantic differential than did those to the ideal subordinate. The five items which did not follow this pattern were: (1) "nice-awful"; (2) "cooperative-negativistic"; (3) "fast-slow"; (4) "adventurous-cautious"; and (5) "active-passive." Of these five, two were shown to be significant: (1) "cooperative-negativistic"; and (2) "fast-slow." Of the other items from the twenty-five, fourteen were shown to be significant: (1) "honest-dishonest"; (2) "friendly-unfriendly"; (3) "pleasant-unpleasant"; (4) "just-unjust"; (5) "unselfish-selfish"; (6) "fair-unfair"; (7) "not jealous-jealous"; (8) "trained-untrained"; (9) "informed-uninformed"; (10) "expert-inexpert"; (11) "skilled-unskilled"; (12) "bold-timid"; (13) "poised-nervous"; and (14) "poised-tense."

For all of the sixteen homophily items, responses to the ideal supervisor conformed more to the extremity assumption of the semantic differential than did those to the ideal subordinate. Of these sixteen, eight were shown to be significant: (1) "thinks like me-doesn't think like me"; (2) "from social class similar to mine-from social class different from mine"; (3) "economic situation like mine-economic situation different from mine"; (4) "background similar to mine-background different from mine"; (5) "sexual attitudes like mine-sexual attitudes unlike mine"; (6) "shares my values-doesn't share my values"; (7) "looks similar to me-looks different from me"; and (8) "resembles me-doesn't resemble me."

Incorporating factor analytic data within an analysis of variance, it

was determined that significant differences existed between the perception of the ideal supervisor and subordinate on one factor of credibility and two factors of homophily. The factor analytic data used in the analysis of variance, however, assumed the perceptual categories were the same for both the ideal supervisor and ideal subordinate respondents, when, in fact, this may not have been the case.

Predicated upon the foregoing analysis, several suggestions for future research may be made. If, in fact, the perception of the ideal source is positioned significantly away from the extreme positive end of the scale, then the coding strategy utilized in the determination of high and low forms of source valence (for example, credibility) within the framework of the semantic differential may have been somewhat faulty in research to date. The extremity assumption of the instrument posits a monotonic function, such that extreme evaluations locate themselves at the ends of the scale. This study, as well as those conducted by Clark, Stewart, and Marston (1972) and Heston (1973), indicates some margin of error in this interpretation, in terms of some, if not all, of the items contained within the instrument. Based upon responses to an ideal source, it would be possible to impose a recoding strategy within the instrument in measuring the perceptions of a live referrent (using the same respondents) to determine if such a strategy allowed for more accurate predictions of perceptions of overall source valence (for example, credibility). Statistically speaking, such a task could be accomplished through the performance of multiple regression analysis, using the overall statement of the construct in question as the criterion variable and the recoded items as the predictor variables.

A second recommendation for future research would be the use of Q-factor analysis to determine if differences in respondent characteristics

were responsible for the variances across items in perceiving the ideal source (assuming that such variances did exist, as they did in this research). Such a technique might reveal subgroups of respondents, each of which could conceivably be defined within demographic categories tapped (or other such parameters), upon the submission of the data to discriminant analysis.

A third recommendation for future research would be the testing of the findings of this and other studies, based upon the semantic differential instrument, upon the Likert scale, through the use of a source valence construct, such as interpersonal attraction, as defined by McCroskey and McCain (1974). If the findings of these studies are valid in challenging the extremity assumption of the semantic differential, it seems reasonable to assume the strength of such a rationale in examining the Likert scale, as an instrument to measure source valence.

A fourth and final recommendation for future research would be in the examination of responses to the ideal source across male and female target sources and male and female subjects. The study reported herein dealt with both male target sources and male subjects. The Heston study did not focus upon a sex variable in any manner. It would seem reasonable to assume that the perception of an ideal source would vary according to such criteria.

FOOTNOTES

1. King (1971).

2. Such evidence is summarized in Heliweg (1974).

3. Source credibility may be defined as the degree of confidence in or favorable disposition toward a communicator. Homophily may be defined as the degree of perceived similarity between source and receiver in reference to a single attribute or a group of attributes.

4. Falcione (1972); Falcione (1973); Falcione (1974a); Falcione (1974b); Falcione (1974c); Falcione (1975); Daly (1975).

5. Rogers and Bhowmik (1970).

6. Tucker (1971); Baudhuin and Davis (1972); McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972); McCroskey, Jensen, Todd, and Toomb (1972); McCroskey, Jensen, and Valencia (1973a); McCroskey, Jensen, and Valencia (1973b).

7. Andersen and Todd (1975).

8. Deviation scores were calculated by comparing the actual cumulative frequencies to the expected cumulative frequencies for each interval of each scale item. Using a range of .000 to 1.000 for possible deviation scores, the researcher assumed that the higher the deviation score, the closer the relationship between the actual and expected distributions, thus the greater the approximation to the assumption of the semantic differential.

9. In this research, Falcione isolated four dimensions of immediate superior credibility: (1) safety; (2) competence; (3) extroversion; and (4) emotional stability.

10. In this research, McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly isolated four dimensions of homophily: (1) attitude; (2) background; (3) value; and (4) appearance.

11. $t = \dfrac{\text{actual } \bar{x} - 1}{\text{standard deviation}/\sqrt{n-1}}$

    (use of this formula assumes that the mean of the ideal source is 1 on the semantic differential scale)

12. $w^2 = \dfrac{t^2 - 1}{t^2 + (n-1)}$

13. For this analysis, as well as others associated with this study, the number "one" was utilized as the positive extreme end of the scale, while the number "seven" was employed as the negative extreme end of the scale.

REFERENCES

Andersen, Peter A., Todd, William R. Scales for the measurement of homophily with public figures. Paper presented at ICA convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1975.

Baudhuin, E. Scott, Davis, Margaret Kis. Scales for the measurement of ethos: Another attempt. Speech Monographs, 1972, 39, 296-301.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Clark, Ruth Anne, Stewart, Roy, Marston, Alan. Scale values for highest and lowest levels of credibility. Central States Speech Journal, 1972, 23, 193-196.

Daly, John A. Listening and interpersonal evaluations. Paper presented at CSSA convention, Kansas City, Missouri, April 1975.

Falcione, Raymond L. A correlational analysis of communication variables and satisfaction with immediate supervision in a large industrial organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1972.

Falcione, Raymond L. Behavioral components of perceived supervisor credibility. Paper presented at ICA convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 1974. (a)

Falcione, Raymond L. Credibility: Qualifier of subordinate participation. Journal of Business Communication, 1974, 11, 43-54. (b)

Falcione, Raymond L. Subordinate satisfaction as a function of perceived supervisor credibility. Paper presented at ICA convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1975.

Falcione, Raymond L. The factor structure of source credibility scales for immediate superiors in the organizational context. Central States Speech Journal, 1974, 25, 63-66. (c)

Falcione, Raymond L. The relationship of supervisor credibility to subordinate satisfaction. Personnel Journal, 1973, 52, 800-803.

Hays, William L. Statistics. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Hellweg, Susan A. Perceived credibility and interpersonal attraction of a communication source: An investigation of prime time television dramatic character portrayals. M.A. thesis, California State College, Dominguez Hills, 1974.

Heston, Judee K. Ideal source credibility: A re-examination of the semantic differential. Paper presented at ICA convention, Montreal, Quebec, April 1973.

King, Stephen William. An experimental analysis of the effects of message type, degree of interpersonal similarity, and type of interpersonal similarity on attitude change and ratings of source credibility. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, Todd, Cynthia. The generalizability of source credibility scales for public figures. Paper presented at the SCA convention, Chicago, Illinois, December 1972.

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, Todd, Cynthia, Toomb, J. Kevin. Measurement of the credibility of organization sources. Paper presented at WSCA convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, November 1972.

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, Valencia, Cynthia. Measurement of the credibility of mass media sources. Paper presented at WSCA convention, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 1973(a).

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, Valencia, Cynthia. Measurement of the credibility of peers and spouses. Paper presented at ICA convention, Montreal, Quebec, April 1973(b).

McCroskey, James C., McCain, Thomas A. The measurement of interpersonal attraction. Speech Monographs, 1974, 41, 261-266.

McCroskey, James C., Richmond, Virginia P., Daly, John A. The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 1975, 1, 323-332.

Rogers, Everett M., Bhowmik, Dilip K. Homophily-heterophily: Relational concepts for communication research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1970, 34, 523-538.

Tucker, Raymond K. On the McCroskey scales for the measurement of ethos. Central States Speech Journal, 1971, 22, 127-129.

Table 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TARGET SOURCES -- CREDIBILITY*

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
honest-dishonest ----------	1.490	1.072	1.291	0.758	1.647	1.246
friendly-unfriendly -------	2.472	1.203	2.324	1.102	2.588	1.269
pleasant-unpleasant -------	2.378	1.090	2.216	0.959	2.508	1.171
nice-awful ----------	3.081	1.128	3.101	1.008	3.065	1.217
good-natured-irritable ----	2.219	1.030	2.155	0.974	2.269	1.072
cooperative-negativistic --	1.656	0.926	1.784	0.966	1.554	0.882
safe-dangerous ----------	2.729	1.433	2.639	1.355	2.800	1.492
just-unjust ----------	1.463	1.082	1.311	0.968	1.583	1.153
unselfish-selfish ---------	2.392	1.349	2.182	1.167	2.559	1.459
fair-unfair ----------	1.349	0.766	1.155	0.505	1.503	0.894
ethical-unethical ---------	1.851	1.179	1.750	1.124	1.930	1.218
mild-headstrong ----------	4.724	1.045	4.646	1.078	4.785	1.017
virtuous-sinful ----------	2.892	1.276	2.764	1.180	2.995	1.342
not jealous-jealous -------	2.746	1.574	2.500	1.519	2.941	1.594
trained-untrained ---------	1.551	0.978	1.432	0.730	1.645	1.131
experienced-inexperienced -	1.841	1.049	1.723	0.856	1.935	1.175
informed-uninformed -------	1.524	0.893	1.405	0.815	1.618	0.941
expert-inexpert ----------	1.742	0.947	1.599	0.669	1.855	1.108
skilled-unskilled ---------	1.709	1.101	1.568	0.778	1.818	1.291
fast-slow ----------	2.284	1.054	2.446	0.992	2.156	1.087
bold-timid ----------	1.955	0.838	1.845	0.771	2.043	0.879
aggressive-meek ----------	1.824	0.835	1.784	0.778	1.856	0.877
emphatic-hesitant ---------	2.319	0.971	2.264	0.950	2.364	0.988
adventurous-cautious ------	2.850	1.213	2.959	1.181	2.763	1.234
forceful-forceless --------	1.749	0.843	1.696	0.706	1.790	0.938
active-passive ----------	1.782	0.990	1.845	0.938	1.733	1.028
poised-nervous ----------	1.833	1.070	1.628	0.802	1.995	1.220
calm-anxious ----------	2.763	1.602	2.599	1.520	2.892	1.657
composed-excitable --------	2.132	1.226	2.041	1.130	2.204	1.295
poised-tense ----------	1.893	1.056	1.730	0.743	2.021	1.235

* This data was computed on the basis of the first interval of the semantic differential being the positive extreme end of the scale and the seventh interval being the extreme negative end of the scale.

Table 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TARGET SOURCES — HOMOPHILY*

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me ----------	3.325	1.200	3.170	1.155	3.449	1.224
Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me ---------	3.444	1.081	3.415	0.985	3.468	1.154
Similar to me-Different from me ----------	3.619	1.045	3.497	1.023	3.717	1.054
Like me-Unlike me ---------	3.530	0.981	3.463	0.960	3.584	0.997
From social class similar to mine-From social class different from mine ----	3.858	1.069	3.660	1.037	4.016	1.071
Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine ----	3.943	1.202	3.741	1.211	4.103	1.173
Status like mine-Status different from mine ----	4.052	1.216	3.904	1.228	4.168	1.196
Background similar to mine-Background different from mine ----------	3.798	0.982	3.667	1.002	3.903	0.956
Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine ----------	2.924	1.247	2.877	1.231	2.962	1.261
Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine ----------	3.581	1.003	3.415	0.992	3.714	0.994
Shares my values-Doesn't share my values --------	2.922	1.305	2.687	1.215	3.108	1.347
Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do ----------	2.958	1.260	2.822	1.230	3.065	1.276

---continued---

Table 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TARGET SOURCES -- HOMOPHILY*(CONTINUED)

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Looks similar to me-Looks different from me ------	3.958	0.976	3.816	0.965	4.070	0.973
Same size as I am-Different size than I am ---------	4.042	0.889	4.027	0.921	4.054	0.864
Appearance like mine-Appearance unlike mine -	3.575	1.223	3.476	1.125	3.654	1.294
Resembles me-Doesn't resemble me ----------	3.970	0.987	3.803	0.941	4.103	1.006

* This data was computed on the basis of the first interval of the semantic differential being the positive extreme end of the scale and the seventh interval being the negative extreme end of the scale.

Table 3

T VALUES AND STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (W^2) FOR TARGET SOURCES-CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	t Value	Strength of Association	t Value	Strength of Association	t Value	Strength of Association
honest-dishonest ----------	8.356	17.04%	4.655	12.25%	7.082	20.81%
friendly-unfriendly -------	22.367	59.85%	14.567	58.80%	17.066	60.82%
pleasant-unpleasant -------	23.036	61.40%	15.373	61.39%	17.468	62.18%
nice-awful ----------	33.565	77.22%	25.271	81.16%	22.954	74.08%
good-natured-irritable ----	21.599	58.23%	14.378	58.16%	16.101	58.13%
cooperative-negativistic --	12.929	33.22%	9.841	39.30%	8.543	27.90%
safe-dangerous ----------	21.951	59.16%	14.616	59.12%	16.365	59.05%
just-unjust ----------	7.822	15.23%	3.895	8.74%	6.896	19.93%
unselfish-selfish ---------	18.831	51.43%	12.280	50.30%	14.533	53.06%
fair-unfair ----------	8.329	16.95%	3.721	7.99%	7.674	23.64%
ethical-unethical ---------	13.194	34.07%	8.090	30.34%	10.413	36.49%
mild-headstrong ----------	64.935	92.68%	40.865	91.91%	50.622	93.23%
virtuous-sinful ----------	27.060	68.65%	18.125	68.88%	20.219	68.68%
not jealous-jealous -------	20.244	55.04%	11.850	49.02%	16.560	59.50%
trained-untrained ---------	10.282	23.87%	7.175	25.43%	7.757	24.14%
experienced-inexperienced -	14.631	38.95%	10.241	41.24%	10.823	38.44%
informed-uninformed -------	10.709	25.39%	6.025	19.26%	8.933	29.76%
expert-inexpert ----------	14.275	37.91%	10.818	44.11%	10.496	36.98%
skilled-unskilled ---------	11.733	29.10%	8.790	34.31%	8.642	28.26%
fast-slow ----------	22.233	59.63%	17.673	67.78%	14.465	52.82%
bold-timid ----------	20.832	56.38%	13.288	54.26%	16.183	58.25%
aggressive-meek ----------	18.039	49.20%	12.218	50.05%	13.313	48.52%
emphatic-hesitant ---------	24.714	64.75%	16.133	63.66%	18.675	65.40%
adventurous-cautious ------	27.786	69.84%	20.043	73.16%	19.431	66.94%
forceful-forceless --------	16.216	43.96%	11.553	48.94%	11.456	41.18%
active-passive ----------	14.439	38.25%	10.922	44.42%	9.724	33.35%
poised-nervous ----------	14.232	37.56%	9.494	37.59%	11.124	39.63%
calm-anxious ----------	19.743	53.86%	12.711	52.21%	15.531	56.36%
composed-excitable --------	16.851	45.86%	11.169	45.54%	12.646	46.07%
poised-tense ----------	15.458	41.53%	11.912	48.77%	11.275	40.28%

Table 4

T VALUES AND STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (ω^2) FOR TARGET SOURCES - HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	t value	Strength of Association	t value	Strength of Association	t value	Strength of Association
Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me ----------	35.249	78.90%	22.701	77.77%	27.141	79.91%
Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me ---------	41.193	83.59%	29.625	85.64%	29.090	81.96%
Similar to me-Different from me ----------	45.524	86.22%	29.495	85.53%	34.874	86.85%
Like me-Unlike me ---------	46.921	86.89%	31.001	86.72%	35.157	86.97%
From social class similar to mine-From social class different from mine ----	48.639	87.69%	30.995	86.72%	38.197	88.74%
Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine ----	44.544	85.66%	27.410	83.62%	35.885	87.43%
Status like mine-Status different from mine ----	45.525	86.26%	28.473	84.72%	35.833	87.46%
Background similar to mine-Background different from mine ----------	51.834	89.00%	32.161	87.55%	41.169	90.16%
Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine ----------	28.026	70.33%	18.359	69.71%	21.106	70.61%
Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine ----------	46.817	86.84%	29.415	85.46%	37.036	88.11%
Shares my values-Doesn't share my values --------	26.795	68.35%	16.778	65.61%	21.229	70.85%
Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do ----------	28.270	70.63%	17.835	68.47%	22.013	72.22%

---continued---

Table 4

T VALUES AND STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (ω^2) FOR TARGET SOURCES-HOMOPHILY (CONTINUED)

Scale Item	Total		Supervisor Target Source		Subordinate Target Source	
	t value	Strength of Association	t value	Strength of Association	t value	Strength of Association
Looks similar to me-Looks different from me ------	55.135	90.15%	35.262	89.42%	42.799	90.82%
Same size as I am-Different size than I am ---------	62.260	92.11%	39.714	91.47%	47.951	92.55%
Appearance like mine-Appearance unlike mine -	38.307	81.54%	26.593	82.77%	27.823	80.69%
Resembles me-Doesn't resemble me ----------	54.666	90.03%	35.991	89.80%	41.724	90.44%

Table 5

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT**

(n = 335)
(all subjects)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Identification of Variable
1	0.30779	0.64755*	0.09567	0.19620	-0.03587	0.35018	honest-dishonest
2	0.77470*	0.21633	0.03422	0.07135	-0.07712	0.21439	friendly-unfriendly
3	0.80881*	0.22684	-0.06758	0.03999	0.04417	0.15124	pleasant-unpleasant
4	0.74672*	0.05391	0.01008	0.08396	0.28735	-0.00562	nice-awful
5	0.68877*	0.18591	0.13727	0.21653	0.21253	0.02296	good-natured-irritable
6	0.36069	0.23638	0.18923	0.15274	0.37988	0.32802	cooperative-negativistic
7	0.38888	0.00331	-0.13966	0.11674	0.61562*	0.06268	safe-dangerous
8	0.03956	0.54314	0.13784	0.07650	-0.07740	0.50563	just-unjust
9	0.17718	0.15237	0.05386	0.09920	0.46683	0.51871	unselfish-selfish
10	0.15403	0.71070*	0.09795	0.19529	-0.04690	0.30579	fair-unfair
11	0.18583	0.56140	-0.00576	0.14100	-0.09818	0.27183	ethical-unethical
12	0.13159	-0.00352	-0.48175	0.34998	-0.03975	0.21800	mild-headstrong
13	0.27301	0.38265	-0.09662	0.15227	0.17837	0.18382	virtuous-sinful
14	0.15338	0.06011	0.03795	0.11451	0.04292	0.68404*	not jealous-jealous
15	0.10414	0.73636*	0.18471	-0.00102	0.33940	0.04156	trained-untrained
16	0.17849	0.55611	0.24141	0.11719	0.47178	-0.01480	experienced-unexperienced
17	-0.00829	0.50724	0.20907	0.23899	0.50630	0.03886	informed-uninformed
18	0.05781	0.80000*	0.13245	0.05742	0.13336	-0.08104	expert-inexpert
19	0.18612	0.72149*	0.18459	0.02577	0.21343	-0.04973	skilled-unskilled
20	0.24400	0.24598	0.44287	0.03338	0.36784	-0.09954	fast-slow
21	0.14115	0.33704	0.60855*	0.15858	0.06679	-0.12096	bold-timid
22	-0.01568	0.06367	0.75433*	0.07141	0.05413	0.06907	aggressive-meek
23	-0.04829	0.20134	0.44513	0.27632	0.17917	0.26472	emphatic-hesitant
24	0.08356	-0.07104	0.58163	-0.06818	-0.19917	0.15757	adventurous-cautious
25	-0.02969	0.40201	0.55937	0.14271	0.37066	0.07582	forceful-forceless
26	-0.01637	0.14107	0.65444*	0.17892	0.02837	0.05995	active-passive
27	0.19067	0.49553	0.19196	0.58572	0.06268	-0 13269	poised-nervous
28	0.00902	0.02899	0.02555	0.74696*	0.06913	0.23798	calm-anxious
29	0.28855	0.12848	0.13444	0.61268*	0.25617	0.13217	composed-excitable
30	0.21344	0.46828	0.22229	0.61888	0.06106	-0.04578	poised-tense
	30.0%	9.3%	5.7%	5.0%	4.3%	3.6%	variance accounted for by factor

* Variable met criteria for factor loading.
** Those factors (4) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 50.1% of the variance.

Table 6

FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR SOURCE CREDIBILITY CONSTRUCT

(n = 335)

(all subjects)

FACTOR 1

friendly-unfriendly
pleasant-unpleasant
nice-awful
good-natured-irritable

FACTOR 2

honest-dishonest
fair-unfair
trained-untrained
expert-inexpert

FACTOR 3

bold-timid
aggressive-meek
active-passive

FACTOR 4

calm-anxious
composed-excitable

Table 7

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR HOMOPHILY CONSTRUCT**

(n = 335)

(all subjects)

Variable Number	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Identification of Variable
1	0.60946*	-0.03959	-0.09221	0.24180	Thinks like me-Doesn't think like me
2	0.74375*	0.20968	0.19966	-0.02115	Behaves like me-Doesn't behave like me
3	0.34521	0.54105	0.30807	0.34313	Similar to me-Different from me
4	0.60058*	0.26844	0.21000	0.22227	Like me-Unlike me
5	0.04703	0.25432	0.71512*	0.00769	From social class similar to mine-From social class different from mine
6	0.18034	-0.21099	0.41497	0.38583	Economic situation like mine-Economic situation different from mine
7	0.16188	0.32268	0.52110	0.02462	Status like mine-Status different from mine
8	0.18498	0.23703	0.68770*	0.04809	Background similar to mine-Background different from mine
9	0.36924	-0.14029	0.50756	0.31364	Morals like mine-Morals unlike mine
10	0.27229	0.07878	0.04905	0.73741*	Sexual attitudes like mine-Sexual attitudes unlike mine
11	0.56120	-0.09161	0.31189	0.16665	Shares my values-Doesn't share my values
12	0.73148*	0.23405	0.19129	-0.01152	Treats people like I do-Doesn't treat people like I do
13	-0.05335	0.68001*	0.32921	0.27536	Looks similar to me-Looks different from me
14	0.03699	0.69017*	0.18213	0.00246	Same size as I am-Different size than I am
15	0.23066	0.57990	-0.02036	0.04130	Appearance like mine-Appearance unlike mine
16	0.00565	0.36935	0.06661	0.74995*	Resembles me-Doesn't resemble me
	30.2%	10.1%	7.2%	6.5%	Variance accounted for by factor

* Variable met criteria for factor loading

** Those factors (4) meeting the criteria for item factor loading accounted for 54.0% of the variance

Table 8

FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR HOMOPHILY CONSTRUCT

(n = 335)

(all subjects)

FACTOR 1

Thinks like me - Doesn't think like me.
Behaves like me - Doesn't behave like me.
Like me - Unlike me.
Treats people like I do - Doesn't treat people like I do.

FACTOR 2

Looks similar to me - Looks different from me.
Same size as I am - Different size than I am.

FACTOR 3

From social class similar to mine - From social class different from mine.
Background similar to mine - Background different from mine.

FACTOR 4

Sexual attitudes like mine - Sexual attitudes unlike mine.
Resembles me - Doesn't resemble me.

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY

HONEST-DISHONEST

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	10.5008	10.5008	9.369*
Within Groups	333	373.2126	1.1208	
Total	334	383.7134		

FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.7540	5.7540	4.011*
Within Groups	333	477.7266	1.4346	
Total	334	483.4806		

PLEASANT-UNPLEASANT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	7.0054	7.0054	5.987*
Within Groups	331	387.3189	1.1701	
Total	332	394.3243		

NICE-AWFUL

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.1071	0.1071	0.084
Within Groups	330	420.6971	1.2748	
Total	331	420.8042		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

GOOD-NATURED-IRRITABLE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.0601	1.0601	1.000
Within Groups	332	351.9848	1.0602	
Total	333	353.0049		

COOPERATIVE-NEGATIVISTIC

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	4.3607	4.3607	5.151*
Within Groups	332	281.0434	0.8465	
Total	333	285.4042		

SAFE-DANGEROUS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2.1113	2.1113	1.028
Within Groups	330	677.4912	2.0530	
Total	331	679.6024		

JUST-UNJUST

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	6.1156	6.1156	5.287*
Within Groups	333	385.1679	1.1567	
Total	334	391.2836		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

UNSELFISH-SELFISH

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	11.6960	11.6960	6.538*
Within Groups	332	593.9238	1.7889	
Total	333	605.6198		

FAIR-UNFAIR

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	9.9630	9.9630	17.820*
Within Groups	333	186.1743	0.5591	
Total	334	196.1373		

ETHICAL-UNETHICAL

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2.6911	2.6911	1.940
Within Groups	333	461.8463	1.3869	
Total	334	464.5373		

MILD-HEADSTRONG

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.5793	1.5793	1.448
Within Groups	331	361.0033	1.0906	
Total	332	362.5826		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

VIRTUOUS-SINFUL

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	4.4022	4.4022	2.718
Within Groups	332	537.7176	1.6196	
Total	333	542.1198		

NOT JEALOUS-JEALOUS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	16.0188	16.0188	6.571*
Within Groups	332	809.3495	2.4378	
Total	333	825.3683		

TRAINED-UNTRAINED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.7298	3.7298	3.932*
Within Groups	332	314.9050	0.9485	
Total	333	318.6347		

EXPERIENCED-INEXPERIENCED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.7221	3.7221	3.405
Within Groups	332	362.8677	1.0930	
Total	333	366.5898		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

INFORMED-UNINFORMED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.7349	3.7349	4.740*
Within Groups	332	261.5735	0.7879	
Total	333	265.3084		

EXPERT-INEXPERT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.3894	5.3894	6.101*
Within Groups	331	292.4004	0.8834	
Total	332	297.7898		

SKILLED-UNSKILLED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.1115	5.1115	4.255*
Within Groups	331	397.6333	1.2013	
Total	332	402.7447		

FAST-SLOW

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	6.9330	6.9330	6.340*
Within Groups	332	363.0461	1.0935	
Total	333	369.9790		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

BOLD-TIMID

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.2449	3.2449	4.676*
Within Groups	333	231.0834	0.6939	
Total	334	234.3284		

AGGRESSIVE-MEEK

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.4263	0.4263	0.611
Within Groups	333	232.1827	0.6972	
Total	334	232.6090		

EMPHATIC-HESITANT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.8304	0.8304	0.880
Within Groups	330	311.3262	0.9434	
Total	331	312.1566		

ADVENTUROUS-CAUTIOUS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.1460	3.1460	2.146
Within Groups	331	485.3465	1.4663	
Total	332	488.4925		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

FORCEFUL-FORCELESS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0 7341	0.7341	1.032
Within Groups	332	236.1401	0.7113	
Total	333	236.8743		

ACTIVE-PASSIVE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.0358	1.0358	1.058
Within Groups	333	326.0567	0.9791	
Total	334	327.0925		

POISED-NERVOUS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	11.0833	11.0833	9.933*
Within Groups	333	371.5555	1.1158	
Total	334	382.6388		

CALM-ANXIOUS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	7.0891	7.0891	2.776
Within Groups	331	845.1692	2.5534	
Total	332	852.2583		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (CONTINUED)

COMPOSED-EXCITABLE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2.2103	2.2103	1.474
Within Groups	332	497.9933	1.5000	
Total	333	500.2036		

POISED-TENSE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	7.0277	7.0277	6.410*
Within Groups	333	365.1036	1.0964	
Total	334	372.1313		

* Significant at .05 level

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - HOMOPHILY

THINKS LIKE ME-
DOESN'T THINK LIKE ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	6.3570	6.3570	4.459*
Within Groups	330	470.5105	1.4258	
Total	331	476.8675		

BEHAVES LIKE ME-
DOESN'T BEHAVE LIKE ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.2287	0.2287	0.195
Within Groups	331	387.9935	1.1722	
Total	332	388.2222		

SIMILAR TO ME-
DIFFERENT FROM ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	3.9836	3.9836	3.681
Within Groups	329	356.0526	1.0822	
Total	330	360.0363		

LIKE ME-UNLIKE ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.2032	1.2032	1.251
Within Groups	330	317.4956	0.9621	
Total	331	318.6988		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - HOMOPHILY (CONTINUED)

FROM SOCIAL CLASS SIMILAR TO MINE-
FROM SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENT FROM MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	10.4018	10.4018	9.329*
Within Groups	330	367.9445	1.1150	
Total	331	378.3464		

ECONOMIC SITUATION LIKE MINE-
ECONOMIC SITUATION DIFFERENT FROM MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	10.6871	10.6871	7.548*
Within Groups	330	467.2255	1.4158	
Total	331	477.9127		

STATUS LIKE MINE-
STATUS DIFFERENT FROM MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.6895	5.6895	3.884
Within Groups	328	480.4347	1.4647	
Total	329	486.1242		

BACKGROUND SIMILAR TO MINE-
BACKGROUND DIFFERENT FROM MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	4.5636	4.5636	4.782*
Within Groups	330	314.9153	0.9543	
Total	331	319.4789		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - HOMOPHILY (CONTINUED)

MORALS LIKE MINE-
MORALS UNLIKE MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.5958	0.5958	0.382
Within Groups	329	512.5160	1.5578	
Total	330	513.1118		

SEXUAL ATTITUDES LIKE MINE-
SEXUAL ATTITUDES UNLIKE MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	7.3009	7.3009	7.402*
Within Groups	330	325.5033	0.9864	
Total	331	332.8042		

SHARES MY VALUES-
DOESN'T SHARE MY VALUES

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	14.5206	14.5206	8.721*
Within Groups	330	549.4433	1.6650	
Total	331	563.9639		

TREATS PEOPLE LIKE I DO-
DOESN'T TREAT PEOPLE LIKE I DO

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	4.8140	4.8140	3.052
Within Groups	330	520.5957	1.5776	
Total	331	525.4096		

(continued)

* Significant at .05 level

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - HOMOPHILY (CONTINUED)

LOOKS SIMILAR TO ME-
LOOKS DIFFERENT FROM ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.2823	5.2823	5.621*
Within Groups	330	310.1273	0.9398	
Total	331	315.4096		

SAME SIZE AS I AM-
DIFFERENT SIZE THAN I AM

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.0590	0.0590	0.075
Within Groups	330	261.3506	0.7920	
Total	331	261.4096		

APPEARANCE LIKE MINE-
APPEARANCE UNLIKE MINE

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2.5913	2.5913	1.736
Within Groups	330	492.5261	1.4925	
Total	331	495.1175		

RESEMBLES ME-DOESN'T RESEMBLE ME

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	7.3809	7.3809	7.726*
Within Groups	329	314.3170	0.9554	
Total	330	321.6979		

* Significant at .05 level

Table 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY

FACTOR 1

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	10.3358	10.3358	3.167
Within Groups	333	1086.7538	3.2635	
Total	334	1097.0896		

FACTOR 2

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	5.3079	5.3079	7.480*
Within Groups	333	236.3084	0.7096	
Total	334	241.6162		

FACTOR 3

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	0.2293	0.2293	0.476
Within Groups	333	160.2702	0.4813	
Total	334	160.4995		

FACTOR 4

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.9340	1.9340	1.115
Within Groups	333	577.7048	1.7348	
Total	334	579.6388		

* Significant at the .05 level

Table 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - HOMOPHILY

FACTOR 1

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	2.9850	2.9850	3.436
Within Groups	333	289.2979	0.8688	
Total	334	292.2829		

FACTOR 2

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	1.2590	1.2590	1.699
Within Groups	333	246.8112	0.7412	
Total	334	248.0701		

FACTOR 3

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	6.4123	6.4123	7.254*
Within Groups	333	294.3757	0.8840	
Total	334	300.7881		

FACTOR 4

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Between Groups	1	8.7064	8.7064	9.214*
Within Groups	333	314.6488	0.9449	
Total	334	323.3552		

* Significant at the .05 level